ON06033

Research Report

Scarborough Board of Education

93-02023/

Elementary CRDI Needs Assessment - Focused Interviews with School-based Curriculum Management Teams (90/91)

Charlene Moore, M.A.,
Research Associate

Lorna Earl, Ph.D.,
Research Director

#91/92 - 12

Focused Interview Sub-committee:

Vicki Bismilla
Gale Carey
Peter Lipman
Susan Macpherson
Bonnie O'Donoghue
Fred Peach
Bill Sparks
Ruth Spearing
Verla Stinson

March, 1992

Lorna Earl, Ph.D., Research Director
General Editor

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to many people for their participation in this study.

The Elementary CRDI Focused Interview Subcommittee was the instrumental group throughout the project, from its initial design, through giving orientation sessions to schools, actual interviewing, data analysis review, giving input on the interpretations, reviewing drafts of the report, to presentation of the results.

This project could not have been undertaken without the time and effort of the educators who volunteered to be interviewers. The interviewers were:

Liz Adamson
Robyn Allin
Derek Arbuckle
Lianne Attersley
Denise Barber
Sharon Bate
John Bebbington
Ron Benson
Vicki Bismilla
Peter Butler
Gale Carey
Jack Charlton
Judy Clarke
Jan Cornwall
Carol Cox
Bruce Daley
John Donofrio
Steve Foster
Bruce Geddes
Karen Goggins
Jan Gray
Fred Huggett
Harry Hunkin
Gary Hunt
Adrienne Johnson
Ernie Klan
Wesley Lorimer
Linda Loth
Doreen MacNamara
Susan Macpherson
D'Arcy Magee
Alyson McLelland
Bonnie Murray
Bonnie O'Donoghue
Earl Park
Susan Parks
Lee Young
Linda Parsons
Fred Peach
Bill Quantock
Pat Schmidt
Mary Shaw
Jim Sheppard
Carol Smith
Bob Smith
Bill Sparks
Ruth Spearing
Verla Stinson
Elaine Wilkes
Brenda Willoughby
Diane Wilson

Training in the focused interview process was conducted by Lorna Earl and Peter Lipman with an overview from Lloyd Jones of Hastings County.

Many people assisted in the preparation of the report. We would like to thank:

Gerty Chiau, Temporary Clerk, for data entry, and helping with data analysis and the production of tables

Yumi Nishizaki, Temporary Clerk, for typing the code book

Deborah Austin, Testing Clerk, for typing the drafts, committee material, Appendices lists, and the final report

Angela Thomson, for typing the Appendices lists

Liz Lundy, former Testing Clerk, for typing committee materials

Clara Ho, Research Associate, for reviewing the final drafts, and proofreading.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
INTRODUCTION	1
METHOD	3
- Procedure	3
Focused Interviews	3
The Interviewers	3
The Interviewees	4
The Interview Process	4
- Data Analysis	4
Reliability and Validity	5
RESULTS	7
Major Question 1: ***What is the status of Program Department Curriculum Implementation Projects in Scarborough elementary schools?***	7
Curriculum Implementation Projects (Table 1-4)	7
Resources Used (Table 5,6)	8
Staff Development Component (Table 7)	8
Problems in Implementing the Project (Table 8)	8
Changes in Classroom Practice (Table 9)	9
Other School Changes (Table 10)	9
Anything CMTs Would Have Done Differently (Table 11)	9
Major Question 2: ***What is the status of other curriculum initiatives in Scarborough elementary schools?***	10
Other Initiatives Happening in the Schools (Table 12-15)	10
Changes in Classroom Practice or in the School, Resulting from Other Initiatives (Table 16)	10
Relationship between Implementation Project and Other School Initiatives (Table 17)	11

Major Question 3: ***How involved are Scarborough elementary schools in school-based curriculum management?*** 11

School Teams (Table 18-22) 11
Roles of Curriculum Management Team Members (Table 23-27) 11
Communication Between Curriculum Management Team and Staff (Table 28) 12
Curriculum Management Plans (Table 29-34) 12

Major Question 4: ***What are the future directions for CRDI activities in Scarborough elementary schools?*** 13

Projects the School Teams Would Like to Initiate (Table 35) 13
Suggested System Initiatives that Teams Think the Program Department, or Other Departments Should Undertake (Table 36) 13
Suggested Program Department Support to Assist in Implementation of New School-Based Initiatives (Table 37) 14
Other System-Wide Changes or Activities Necessary to Facilitate CRDI Implementation (Table 38) 14

APPENDICES

A Elementary CRDI Focused Interview Preamble 19
B Interview Questions, and "Areas to Be Discussed During the Focused Interview" 23
C Results Tables 31
D Human Resources Used to Assist Schools in Their Projects 69
E Material Resources Used to Assist Schools in Their Projects 77
F Memo to Principals (February 8, 1991) 81

INTRODUCTION

The Scarborough Board of Education's Curriculum Review, Development and Implementation (CRDI) model employs school improvement teams, known as Curriculum Management Teams (CMTs) to design and co-ordinate a school Curriculum Management Plan (CMP).

This shift to school-based curriculum planning is based upon considerable North American research which shows that effective educational change occurs at the school level, and is best implemented by those who work most directly with the students.

Program Department's CRDI Policy Manual (1988) clearly stated the expectation that each elementary and secondary school would have a CMT, that the principal must be a member of the team, and that each school must devise a plan to implement the school curriculum initiatives. The publication of the Manual occurred after approximately four years of discussion and staff development activities concerning the reasons for the move to school-based curriculum planning.

The Ministry of Education's directives in OSIS, particularly the newly articulated goals of education, a new "image of the learner" and the need to "renew" courses at the intermediate and senior level, necessitated a model for planned educational change to implement Ministry initiatives. (The Ministry of Education also mandated that each Board must have a CRDI model in place). The need became more imperative, of course, given Ministry "restructuring" of the K-OAC system.

Program Department subsequently issued a variety of support documents including "Three Steps Toward Success", "A Guide to Courses of Study" and "A Guide To Curriculum Reviews" to assist schools with the CRDI process.

Although there is one CRDI policy, a different process evolved in the secondary and elementary panels. In the secondary schools, CMT's were required to write, and submit to Program Department, a school Curriculum Management Plan which outlined and summarized the school's curriculum development and staff development activities. All schools submitted a Plan in accordance with Program Department requests, by June 1990. Several have subsequently been revised and resubmitted, although there has been no directive from Program Department to do so.

In the elementary panel, however, each school selects a school-wide Curriculum Implementation Project (CIP) from a list issued jointly each year by Program and Student and Community Services Departments, and led by personnel from those two departments. These projects must involve all staff members, rather than being directed particularly at a grade or division, and are in addition to projects initiated in the Area by the Associate Superintendent/Schools. The process was refined in the last two years to make it clear that schools could design their own project with the approval of the Associate Superintendent/Schools.

Focused interviews were conducted in 1988-89 with all the secondary schools to provide the CRDI Committee with a picture of their CRDI initiatives. That review was initiated by the Secondary CRDI Committee and coordinated by a subcommittee. A full report is contained in the Research Department's "Secondary CRDI Needs Assessment Report" (#89/90-01) and

the accompanying "Executive Summary and Recommendations". In 1990, the CRDI Committee decided to conduct a similar focused interview process with the CMTs in all elementary schools for the following reasons:

- the success of the secondary project
- the different approach to curriculum change in the elementary panel
- the length of time (since 1984) that elementary schools had been involved in the CRDI process
- the professional growth experience for the interviewers.

The project was designed and coordinated by a subcommittee composed of elementary principals and vice-principals and Program Department staff under the auspices of the CRDI Committee, which held final authority over the project and report.

The objectives of the study were:

1. To describe the CRDI process in elementary schools.
2. To assist the school and system administration in the task of providing instructional leadership.
3. To identify strengths and weaknesses in the CRDI process.
4. To identify human and material resources.
5. To help create future directions for school and system approaches to curriculum management.
6. To provide training in focused interview techniques to elementary instructional leaders in Scarborough.

An "Executive Summary and Recommendations" accompanies this report to assist all "system partners" in improving the CRDI process and the quality of education for students in our schools.

METHOD

PROCEDURE

Focused Interviews

A focused interview is a data collection procedure in which the questions asked in an interview are predetermined and focused on a particular subject of concern. The topic for this study was CRDI activity in the school, and an interview protocol was created from questions which evolved from four major questions that were established at the beginning of the study. These major questions were:

1. What is the status of Program Department Curriculum Implementation Projects in Scarborough elementary schools?

2. What is the status of other curriculum initiatives in Scarborough elementary schools?

3. How involved are Scarborough elementary schools in school-based curriculum management?

4. What are the future directions for CRDI activities in Scarborough elementary schools?

The CRDI Focused Interview Subcommittee developed the interview questions and created a preamble (Appendix A) so that the interviewers could give the respondents a rationale, a description of the process, what was expected of interviewees, assurance of confidentiality, description of how results would be used, and an overview of topics to be discussed.

Three schools participated in a pilot in February 1991. The Subcommittee met to review the results, and discuss the experience. They examined the draft interview protocol for clarity of questions, and succinctness and discussed the logistics of the process, overall response, and the time required to complete the interview. Only a minor change was deemed necessary in the final interview form. (See Appendix B for interview questions.)

The Interviewers

The Subcommittee considered CRDI implementation a complex issue, requiring very knowledgeable interviewers, and also wanted the needs assessment to be seen as an important project. Therefore, highly respected educators (elementary school administrators, and central office staff) from within the Scarborough Board of Education who had a history of involvement in CRDI activities, were chosen and trained as interviewers. They participated in a one day orientation concerning focused interviews with an overview from Lloyd Jones of Hasting County and a description of the Scarborough project from Peter Lipman and Lorna Earl. This was followed by one day of practical training in the interview techniques.

There were 25 pairs of interviewers (usually one central staff person, and one school-based person), each assigned to 5-7 schools outside their Area and a mix of JK-6, JK-8 and Senior Public Schools.

The Interviewees

Each school principal was asked to arrange for the Curriculum Management Team, and any other staff members considered appropriate, to participate in the group interview. Most teams consisted of the principal, vice-principal, chairpersons, and teachers. The Associate Superintendents/Schools were strongly encouraged to attend all school interviews in their Areas. All 138 elementary schools in the Scarborough Board participated.

The Interview Process

All school principals were informed about the pending interviews in the fall of 1990. The interviewers scheduled the interviews with their assigned schools, and Associate Superintendents/Schools, to occur between March and June 1991. Principals were sent summary sheets of '*Areas to be Discussed during Elementary Focused Interview*' and encouraged to meet with their team prior to the interview, to familiarize themselves with the process (Appendix B).

Interviews usually lasted 1-2 hours. The interviewers used the preamble to explain the process, emphasized that responses would not identify any schools or individuals, that the results would help the CRDI Committee to describe the current state of initiatives in Scarborough elementary schools, and to plan future directions. The school team members were asked to respond freely, and answer questions specifically as they related to the school or project in general. If they considered it necessary to elicit a fuller response, the interviewers could use extended questions related to the set questions on the protocol to encourage more detailed information.

The interviewers took turns making notes during the interview, met immediately afterwards to reconstruct their notes on the responses, and to prepare a joint response form to submit for analysis.

DATA ANALYSIS

All completed response sheets were returned to the Research Centre, and prepared for data analysis. Each school was assigned an ID number, and all identifying information was then removed from the response sheet to ensure confidentiality.

Category codes were created for responses to all questions by the Research Associate in consultation with the committee, based on the kinds of responses given. All coding was done by one Research Associate.

The data were analysed using SPSS/PC 4.0 and frequencies tabulated on the full data set.

Reliability and Validity

Several features of the research design of the study ensured the **reliability** of the data interpretation. The interviewers worked in pairs, and were well trained in a standardized procedure. Even though they had the same training, some variation did occur in the extent of detail of the responses recorded, i.e. some paraphrasing was used, and some interviewers recorded responses 'verbatim'. This variation in amount and detail made some of the coding difficult.

Only one Research Associate read and coded all the response forms. When it was difficult to determine an accurate interpretation of a response, the Research Associate conferred with the committee members for their input. [Therefore coding was a very lengthy part of the study.] The meaning of a response sometimes had to be gleaned from the context of the whole interview, or from large relevant sections of the response form.

The **validity** of the responses depends on how accurately and honestly the Curriculum Management Teams described the activities in their school, concerning their CRDI projects. This is difficult to assess, but since the interviews were conducted with groups, it would be less likely that school activities could be seriously misrepresented.

In addition, **the frequency of activities occurring is likely higher than actually reported, since responses were given without prompting. The collective results are therefore 'conservative estimates', or underestimates of the real situation.**

RESULTS

The results section of this report **highlights** the most frequent responses made by the Curriculum Management Teams and relates the responses to the major questions that the study was designed to answer. Since some creative ideas were mentioned by only one or two teams, the interested reader might want to refer to the tables in Appendix C, which contain complete lists of the response categories for each question and the number and percent of schools that made a response in each category. The specific tables are included in parentheses after each subheading.[1]

Major Question 1 - What is the status of Program Department Curriculum Implementation Projects in Scarborough elementary schools?

The interview questions in this section addressed these areas: *curriculum implementation projects, how and when the projects were chosen, how long it was expected they would be a primary focus, human and material resources used in the project, staff development, implementation problems or impediments, changes occurring in classroom practice or the school, and anything the team would do differently.*

Curriculum Implementation Projects (Tables 1-4):

- The projects most frequently named were:

School-designed[2]	20%
Blueprint	15%
Co-operative/Small Group Learning	11%
Active Student-Centred Learning	10%
Environmental Awareness	10%
English Language B (whole language)	9%
Computers in Education	9%

[1] The numbers in these results do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed.

[2] School-designed projects are unique school-specific projects, or a combination of projects selected from the Program Department project list.

- For most schools (70%), the project was **chosen by school staff with staff input to the Curriculum Management Team**. In 20% of the cases, the principal primarily made the decision.

- A majority of schools (65%) reported having decided on the project **within the last school year.** For 22%, the choice was made in previous years.

- The project was **expected to be a primary focus in the school for an indefinite period** by 30% of schools, and for approximately two years by 30%.

Resources Used (Table 5,6):

- A large number of human and material resources were mentioned (See Appendices D and E for complete lists).

- A great majority of schools reported using the **assistance of the Program Department staff as a resource** in their project (82%). **In-school staff** was also a major human resource, cited by 62%. Half (50%) used **other Board specialists** and 33% used **human resources from the community**.

- A similar range of material resources were identified. The **curriculum resources of the Board** were named by 65% as a material resource used in the project; 30% mentioned **library or media resources** and 23% said **computer software and equipment.**

Staff Development Component (Table 7):

- **Staff development programs offered by the Program Department, Student and Community Services Department or the Area**, were the most commonly used form of staff development (60%). **Program-specific sessions for school staff** were the next most frequently cited (42%). **Conferences** (38%), **informal sharing at staff development meetings** (36%) **and having a PA day on the topic** (36%), were also major types of staff development, as were **sharing expertise among staff** (30%) and **regular assistance from Program Department** (27%).

Problems in Implementing the Project (Table 8):

- The schools identified four categories of constraints: resources, staff, community and organizational impediments. The leading resource constraints were **time** (65%), **finances** (30%) **materials** (29%) and **human resources** (28%); no other resource problems were identified by more than 4% of the schools.

- Almost one-quarter (24%) of the schools indicated **staff resistance to change or fear of change** was a problem with 19% noting they were **trying to do too much.** Seventeen percent (17%) noted **problems among staff reaching concensus** and 15% noted excessive **staff turnover** as a problem.

- **Community-related problems** were noted by a few schools (4-8%) and 24% identified **organizational constraints** but these difficulties varied from school to school. Ten schools (7%) indicated there was some confusion about the project and problems with communication.

Changes in Classroom Practice (Table 9):

- The schools indicated that the projects were responsible for a diverse number of classroom changes, with 38% of the schools **indicating improved teaching techniques**, and 36% **new kinds of activities** occurring in classrooms. Schools noted that **staff relationships improved** (32%), the **school program was more balanced and focused** (31%), **student social and personal interaction improved** (26%), there was **increased staff awareness** (24%), and **more collaboration and peer coaching among students** (24%). It was interesting to note that 18% noticed **improved student behaviour** generally, 15% noted **improved student attitudes**, and 12% stated that **student achievement improved**.

Other School Changes (Table 10):

- More than half (52%) of the schools made **organizational changes** in the areas of budget, materials and equipment. A wide variety of other school changes included **using staff in new ways** (28%), **changing school organization** (20%), **improved school climate** (17%), **increased collaboration** (17%), **the sharing of ideas** (14%), more **community involvement** (14%), additional **co-operation** (13%), more **balanced programs** (13%) **broader and enriched programs** (13%) **increased staff leadership** (13%), **new/different activities** (11%) and **improved student self-esteem** (7%).

Anything CMTs Would Have Done Differently (Table 11):

- Almost one-third (31%) of the schools would make changes in the **planning and implementation stages** if they could start the project again, and almost an equal number (28%) would **increase staff preparation and awareness** in advance. One quarter (25 %) of the schools would **not do anything differently** in implementing their project.

Major Question 2 - What is the status of other curriculum initiatives in Scarborough elementary schools?

Questions in this section concerned *other curriculum initiatives also happening in the schools, their relationship to the major CRDI projects, and changes in classroom practices or in the school resulting from those other initiatives.*

Other Initiatives Happening in the Schools (Table 12-15):

- Aside from the specific Curriculum Implementation Project, over 60 other curriculum initiatives were recorded. **Computer-based initiatives** such as the creation of labs, process writing and cross-curricular use were mentioned by 41% of the schools, **community outreach activities** were noted by one-third (33%) of the schools, and **environmental concerns** by more than one-quarter (27%). Initiatives in **extra curricular activities**, **self-esteem** and **values education** were identified by 19%, 19% and 17% of the schools respectively.

- The number of initiatives happening in the schools, including their curriculum implementation projects (CIP), ranged from one to eighteen, with most schools (57%) naming between four and seven projects/innovations, and six being the most frequent.

- When asked which initiative was the school's highest priority, 58% of teams named their CIP; 28% of cases identified one of their other initiatives as more important than the CIP named; and 9% named more than one project as highest priority.

- The teams indicated that they named a project as highest priority because it **gave focus to everything else** in the school (38%), it **filled a need** in the school (22%), or it had the **greatest staff support and involvement** (17%).

Changes in Classroom Practice or in the School, Resulting From Other Initiatives (Table 16):

- Other school initiatives were seen as leading to **more community involvement or understanding** (26%), **new kinds of activities** (25%), **improved student behaviour** (23%), **better student interaction** (20%), **changes in student attitudes** (20%), and **more balanced programs** (18%).

Relationship Between Implementation Project and Other School Initiatives (Table 17):

- Ninety-three percent (93%) of schools reported the relationship to be **complementary or integrated.**

Major Question 3 - How involved are Scarborough elementary schools in school-based curriculum management?

These questions were about *the curriculum management teams in the schools, members' roles, and their curriculum management plans (content, how they were developed and amended).*

School Teams (Table 18-22):

- Almost all (88%) schools said they **do have a team** dealing with curriculum matters.
- More than half the respondents called their team the **Curriculum Management Team, or Curriculum Planning Team** (55%). For 22%, it was their Administrative Team, or Leadership Team.
- The size of the team was usually **three to six people** with 41% of the schools having either 4 or 5 members; for 22% of schools, the number of members was unclear or unknown.
- Principals (88%), chairpersons (84%), teachers (53%) and vice-principals (44%) were most frequently identified as team members. In 11 schools (8%) the entire staff was the CMT.
- Members were chosen because of their **position or role** (41%), their **interest** (30%), or they were **selected or appointed by the principal** (19%). About a quarter (24%) of schools did not respond to this question.

Roles of Curriculum Management Team Members (Table 23-27):

- The principal attended almost all (98%) of the focused interviews. The principals' role was described as **facilitating and co-ordinating** (45%), **supporting and encouraging** (44%), **initiating and visioning** (40%), **providing resources** (37%) and **providing leadership** (30%).

- In 47% of the schools there is no vice-principal. In the schools with VPs 89% attended the interviews. Vice-principals' roles were **supporting or giving recognition** (19%), **facilitating and collaborating** (19%), and **co-ordinating and arranging meetings** (17%).

- Chairpersons attended almost all (94%) of the interviews. Chairpersons' roles included **leading workshops and serving as role models** (56%), **communicating** (56%), **facilitating and co-ordinating** (53%) and **working with teachers on implementation** (28%). Seventeen per cent (17%) of chairpersons **serve as a resource** and **plan, provide and evaluate staff development**.

- Teachers attended 76% of the interviews. Teachers' roles on the CMTs were outlined as **communicating and sharing ideas** (56%), **leading, organizing and encouraging** (50%), **serving as a resource and helping others** (43%) and **working on implementation** (28%). In eleven cases, (8%) teachers were not involved or had no special role.

- The Associate Superintendents/Schools were in attendance at two-thirds of the interviews. In four-fifths (81%) of the interviews the Associate Superintendents' roles were described as **supporting, encouraging, and facilitating**. Other roles identified included **providing resources** such as money, **professional development and staffing** (45%), **arranging Area activities** (39%), **monitoring the curriculum implementation projects** (23%), and **arranging meetings with school personnel** (23%).

Communication Between Curriculum Management Team and Staff (Table 28):

- Communication between the CMT and the rest of the staff included **informal discussion** (80%), **regular staff meetings or planning meetings** (66%), **written forms of communication** (45%), **division or grade meetings** (30%), **informal staff meetings** (20%) and **project committee meetings** (20%).

Curriculum Management Plans (Table 29-34):

- A total of 63% of the schools have a Curriculum Management Plan and 20% have a partial or general plan. Seventeen per cent (17%) of schools do not have a CMP. Half the schools reported that the CMP is written, with one quarter of the schools having a partially written plan while one quarter do not have a written plan.

- Thirty per cent (30%) of the schools did not describe their plan, or had none. Of the plans that were described, 49% contained **objectives/goals**, 36% **action plans**, 35% **timelines**, 17% **evaluation or monitoring practices** and 13% **staff development activities**.

- Generally, staff had a large degree of input into the creation of the plans with **all staff** contributing through cooperative discussion (38%), or a team production with **staff input and approval** (33%).

- In 43% of the interviews, schools did not respond to the staff development component of the plan or indicated they had already mentioned it in a previous question. Twenty-two per cent (22%) noted they were allowed time to attend professional development sessions and conferences and another 22% noted Board staff development sessions.

- Amendments to the plan are usually through staff input: **staff discusses and evaluates the plan** (49%), **modifies according to needs** (37%) or through **ongoing informal evaluation** (30%).

Major Question 4 - What are the future directions for CRDI activities in Scarborough elementary schools?

This section looked at *future initiatives of the schools and the Program (or other) Department, as well as the kinds of support wanted or needed, to assist with CRDI implementation.*

Projects the School Teams Would Like to Initiate in the Future (Table 35):

- Schools identified a large number of possible future projects, although 30% indicated they will continue with the same project(s) or that it was too early to know at the time of the interview. The future initiatives most often identified were: a **mathematics** project (20%); **school-based staff development** (16%), **community liaison** (14%) and **computers in education** (14%). Environmental initiatives, daily physical education, collaborative approaches, values education, conflict resolution, ESL, student evaluation, language arts and science each were mentioned by at least 10 schools (7-12%).

Suggested System Initiatives that Teams Think the Program Department, or Other Departments, Should Undertake (Table 36):

- The schools suggested many possible initiatives for Program and other Board departments; **school-based staff development** (36%); **more support from Program Department personnel** (18%); **more money for projects and staff development** (17%), and **staff development sessions on specific issues** based on needs and interests, such as computers, mathematics and Blueprint (17%). Twenty schools (15%) indicated there should be **fewer initiatives** and **reduced pressure and expectations.**

Suggested Program Department Support to Assist in Implementation of Future School-Based Initiatives (Table 37):

- In terms of support from Program Department, two-thirds (67%) of the schools requested **more money** be made available. Forty-one per cent (41%) wanted **more consultative support** from the department or a change in how that support is given. One-third of the schools (33%) wanted **increased release time**, 30% wanted **more resources**, slightly less (29%) wanted **more time to plan and share ideas**, and one-quarter (25%) wanted Program Department to **encourage schools to develop their own initiatives** and employ school-based staff development.

Other System-Wide Changes or Activities/Needed to Facilitate CRDI Implementation (Table 38):

- Specific resources were again named as the major system-wide change/activity necessary to facilitate CRDI implementation (26%). Many schools wanted the system to facilitate sharing of information or experience between schools (22%). Also a number of schools expressed the desire to control their own PA days (17%).

APPENDICES

APPENDICES

A - Elementary CRDI Focused Interview Preamble

B - Interview Questions and "Areas to Be Discussed During the Focused Interview"

C Results Tables

Table 1: Curriculum Implementation Projects
Table 2: How Decision Was Made to Choose This Project
Table 3: When Decision Was Made to Choose This Project
Table 4: How Long Do You Think This Project Will Be a Primary School Focus
Table 5: Human Resources Used
Table 6: Material Resources Used
Table 7: Staff Development
Table 8: Problems in Implementing the Project
Table 9: Changes in Classroom Practice
Table 10: Other School Changes
Table 11: Anything CMTs Would Have Done Differently
Table 12: Other Initiatives Happening in the Schools
Table 13: Number of Initiatives for School
Table 14: Which Initiative Is the School's Highest Priority
Table 15: Why It Is a Priority
Table 16: Changes in Classroom Practice or in the School
Table 17: Relationship Between Implementation Project and Other Initiatives
Table 18: Do You Have a Team That Deals With Curriculum Matters
Table 19: Name of Curriculum Management Team
Table 20: Number of People on Team
Table 21: Curriculum Management Team Members
Table 22: How Members Were Chosen
Table 23: Role of Principal
Table 24: Role of Vice-Principal
Table 25: Role of Chairperson
Table 26: Role of Teachers
Table 27: Role of Superintendent
Table 28: Communication with Staff
Table 29: Do You Have a Curriculum Management Plan for Your School
Table 30: Describe Your Plan
Table 31: Is There a Written Plan
Table 32: How Plan Was Created
Table 33: Staff Development Component of Plan
Table 34: How Plan Was Amended
Table 35: Projects You Would Like to Initiate in the Future
Table 36: Suggested System Initiatives for Program or Other Board Departments
Table 37: Types of Support Required from Program Department
Table 38: Other System Changes Needed to Facilitate CRDI
Table 39: Additional Comments
Table 40: Observations by Interviewers

D - Human Resources Used to Assist School in Their Projects

E - Material Resources Used to Assist School in Their Projects

F - Memo to Principals (February 8, 1991)

APPENDIX A

ELEMENTARY CRDI

FOCUSED INTERVIEW

PREAMBLE

INTERVIEW #1

Before we start into the interview questions, I'm going to take a few minutes and give you some background so that you all know what we're trying to do. As I'm sure you all know, the Scarborough Board has been involved for many years in a number of initiatives to support and improve curriculum in elementary schools. Before I continue, I should say that when we talk about curriculum, we're using the Ministry definition that considers curriculum to be all of the learning experiences that take place in schools. Over the years the Program Department has sponsored a number of conferences for in-school leaders, it has supported a number of "implementation projects" and, in the last couple of years, it has provided support and direction for the creation of in-school curriculum teams to plan curriculum initiatives.

In 1989 the Program Department conducted focused interviews with the Curriculum Management Teams in the secondary schools. This process proved to be a very efficient way of getting a "snapshot" of the curriculum activities in Scarborough schools to help the Program Department determine their future directions and it provided the schools themselves with information to assess their own progress and to plan for the next few years. When the CRDI Committee was reflecting on the results of the secondary focused interviews, they decided that this process would be just as valuable as a way of highlighting curriculum in the elementary schools. And that's why we're here. This is not an evaluation of CRDI, except in the formative sense that the Program Department will use the information to plan how they support the schools in the future.

INTERVIEWER #2

Now, let me tell you a little bit about our agenda and the process that we're using. There are several groups represented here and I'd like to tell you a little bit about the role we see each of you playing. ____ and I are a two-person team representing the CRDI Committee. Teams like us, made up of school administrators and centrally assigned personnel are doing the same kind of interview in every elementary school. You are the curriculum leaders in this school. The CRDI committee thought that it would be important for all of you to contribute to this discussion and to learn from each other in the process. We hope that you will feel free to answer questions, interject or provide clarification as we go along. The questions are not directed at any particular person and we'd like to hear as many points of view as we can. ____ and I will share the task of asking questions and we're both going to try to take notes as you talk so that we have a record of the discussion.

INTERVIEWER #1

You are probably wondering what we will do with all of the information that we collect. Before we begin, let me assure you that all of the specific information that we collect will be kept confidential. Obviously, everyone here will know what has been said but neither your responses nor your school will be identified in any report. When all of the interviews have been completed, the Research Department will prepare a general report of the overall state of CRDI in Scarborough elementary schools that you can use for discussion and planning either in the school or at the area level and the Program Department will use it to plan their future directions as well.

INTERVIEWER #2

As you probably already know from the advance publicity about this event, we're interested in gathering information at the school level as a means of furthering CRDI initiatives in the schools and in the system. This sheet describes the areas that we are going to discuss. To keep the interview to a reasonable time, try to listen carefully to the questions and target your answers to the specific questions. Try not to jump ahead to areas that we'll come to later. We've discovered that everyone wants to tell us about their great resources or the impediments that they faced during the earlier questions that are more general. If that happens, we may cut you off and redirect you so that we're not here all day.

APPENDIX B

ELEMENTARY FOCUSED INTERVIEWS

Interview Questions[1]

Interviewer #1

This first series of questions is related to the Program Department Curriculum Implementation Project of the approved school-designed project that is ongoing at this school. We are interested in finding out some details about how the projects are being implemented in the elementary schools and in the impact that they are having on the schools.

1a. What is (are) the curriculum implementation project(s) with which you are involved?

_____

_____

1b. How and when was the decision made to choose this particular project for your school?

_____

_____

1c. What human and material resources have you used to assist you in this project?

Human	Materials

1d. Describe any staff development that has taken place as a part of the implementation project (extended - for individuals, in the school, conferences, etc.)

_____

_____

1e. Have you experienced any problems or impediments in trying to implement this project?

_____

_____

[1]The full protocol included sufficient space for interviewers to record the responses.

1f. Please describe any changes you have noticed in classroom practice as a result of the project.

_____

_____

1g. Have there been any other changes in the school as a result of this project (extended-budget, staffing, school organization)?

_____

_____

1h. How long do you think you'll have this project as a primary focus in the school?

_____

_____

1i. If you could start the project again, would you do anything differently?

_____

_____

Interviewer #2

Schools have indicated that the implementation projects are not the only initiatives in schools. The next set of questions asks about those other initiatives in your school.

2a. List any innovations or initiatives apart from the CRDI implementation project that are happening in this school. (do not describe).

_____

_____

2b. When you think of all of your initiatives including the implementation project, which one is the school's highest priority? Why?

_____

_____

2C. Pick one of your curriculum intiatives other than the project and describe it briefly for us.

_____

_____

2d. Describe any changes you have noticed in classroom practice or in the school as a result of this particular initiative.

2e. What is the relationship between your implementation project and your other initiatives? (extended - complementary or competitve).

During the last few years, the Program Department has been promoting a shift from centralized curriculum management and planning to more school-based curriculum management. The next series of questions are about how this school manages curriculum and about any planning that you've done so far.

3a. Do you have a school team that meets regularly to discuss and/or plan curriculum matters? What do you call that team?

3b. Who is on the team? How were the members of this team selected?

3c. What role have each of you played in CRDI and curriculum management?

Principal:

Vice-Principal:

Chairperson(s):

Teacher:

Associate Superintendent/Schools

3d. How do the curriculum team and the staff communicate with each other?

3e. Do you have a curriculum management plan for your school? If yes, please describe it for us. Is there a writtem plan? (extended-format, content, objectives, timelines).

3f. How was your plan created?

3g. What school-based and system-wide staff development has been built into your plan? (if there is any other than that mentioned previously)

3h. How does your curriculum plan get amended?

Interviewer #1

We've talked a lot so far about the particular initiatives and plans that are ongoing in the school. The last series of questions ask for your suggestions for the future.

4a. Describe any projects/initiatives that your team would like to initiate over the next few years.

4b. What initiatives do you think Program Department or other departments at the board should undertake as system initiatives during the next few years?

_____

_____

4c. What support should Program Department make available to assist in the implementation of new school-based initiatives?

_____

_____

4d. What other system-wide changes or activities do you think are necessary to facilitate CRDI implementation?

_____

_____

Closing Question

Is there anything else that you'd like to add that we haven't talked about already in the interview?

_____

_____

Interviewer Observations:

_____

_____

AREAS TO BE DISCUSSED DURING ELEMENTARY FOCUSED INTERVIEWS

1. Program Department Curriculum Implementation Projects

- nature of project
- human and financial resources
- staff development
- problems
- changes in school
- expected duration of project
- reflections on project

2. Other Curriculum Initiatives

- highlights
- priorities
- changes in school
- relationship with curriculum project

3. School-based Curriculum Management

- team structure and membership
- roles
- communication with staff
- curriculum management plan
- staff development
- change process

4. Future Directions

- upcoming projects/initiatives
- suggestions for system initiatives
- Program Department support

APPENDIX C

Table 1

Curriculum Implementation Projects		
Project Name	**Frequency**	**Percent**
"School -Designed" (a combination of school-specific projects)	28	20%
Blueprint for the Future (prefered direction for special education	20	15%
Co-operative Small Group Learning	15	11%
Active Student Centred Learning	14	10%
Environmental Awareness	14	10%
English Language B - (whole language, a holistic focus)	13	9%
Computers in Education	12	9%
Drama across Curriculum	8	6%
Thinking Skills	8	6%
Guidance	7	5%
School Strategic Planning	5	4%
Values Across Curriculum	5	4%
English Language A - (language policy validation, implementing holistic language program)	4	3%
English component in French Immersion	3	2%
Science is Happening Here	3	2%
Other Projects named, (not on lists)	3	2%
English Language C - (early reading, emergent literacy)	2	1%
Collaborative Schools	1	1%
Discipline-based Art Education	1	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 2

How Decision Was Made to Choose This Project	Frequency	Percent
Initiated from within school - by staff (discussion, concerns, needs)/CMT, with staff input	97	70%
Initiated by principal/principal's interest or background a factor	27	20%
Developed from another focus area/project/related programs	16	12%
Initiated from school - from previous principal, project	14	10%
Initiated by Board	11	8%
Pilot school chosen	6	4%
Were already doing similar things	6	4%
Area was "high profile"/due to staff expertise	5	4%
Initiated at school level - (e.g., chairperson)	3	2%
Resources were here/special facility	3	2%
Thought it would improve school	3	2%
Make better use of resources	3	2%
Considered "appropriate" topic - (e.g., characteristic of student population; a current thrust)	2	1%
Unclear	2	1%
Initiated by Ministry/guidelines	1	1%
No response	1	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 3

When Decision Was Made to Choose This Project	Frequency	Percent
Within last year - this school year/last school year	90	65%
From previous years, previous admin. - 2 years ago	30	22%
No response	18	13%
At meeting/PD day/Area day	9	7%
"Evolved"..	4	3%

+ N.B. The figures in the table do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 4

How Long Do You Think This Project Will Be a Primary School Focus	Frequency	Percent
End of next year/1-2 more years/Two years +	42	30%
Ongoing, indefinite/"permanent"	41	30%
3 to 5 years	28	20%
For this school year only	19	14%
It depends on/don't know yet	7	5%
No response	1	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 5

Human Resources Used		
Human Resources	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Program Department staff - (e.g., Co-ordinator, JK-4 Centre, TSA)	113	82%
In-school staff	85	62%
Other departments, Board specialist - (e.g., consultant, Area enrichment staff)	69	50%
Community - (e.g., artists, business, public institution, association)	46	33%
Parents - helpers, group meetings	33	24%
Ministry/OISE/other Boards, external education consultant	24	17%
Area staff/from other schools	21	15%
Program/Workshop/Training/Conference	19	14%
Board-unspecified - (e.g., itinerants, committee, support staff)	17	12%
Student coaching/secondary student/buddy program	16	12%
Co-op students	6	4%
Faculty of Education students/York University students	6	4%
Educational Assistants	5	4%
Unidentified	4	3%
Other Associate Superintendents - Program/Planning	3	2%
Associate Superintendents/Schools	2	1%
Trustees	2	1%
Additional Staffing - (e.g., hire supportive teachers, librarian)	1	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 6

Material Resources Used		
Material Resources	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Curriculum resources of Board - (e.g., resource books, units, kits)	90	65%
Library material; General media	41	30%
Computer software, equipment	31	23%
New books/Copy of special book	30	22%
School-designed materials	27	20%
Professional journals/Documents,papers.	26	19%
Videos, media - (e.g., records, tapes, films)	24	17%
Community resources - from external agencies (e.g., education/social services/companies)	21	15%
Additional funding - from Department, Board	20	15%
Additional funding - Unspecified/other groups	16	12%
Theme materials	14	10%
Additional funding - from school budget	12	9%
Shared school equipment, materials	11	8%
Conference literature, publishers' display, Authors' Week	10	7%
Other schools' documents, materials	6	4%
Additional funding - from Parents' Association/community	6	4%
Community fundraising	5	4%
No response	3	2%
Program Department newsletters	2	1%
Resource room set up	1	1%
Additional funding for special program - (e.g., Program-Assisted school)	1	1%
Other	1	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 7

Staff Development		
Staff Development	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Program Department/Student Services Department/ Area inservice	82	60%
Program Specific inservice for staff - (tailored/designed for school, presented at school)	58	42%
Conferences	53	38%
Informal sharing, Staff development meetings	50	36%
PA Day on topic - (school chose/arranged)	49	36%
Share knowledge, expertise among staff - mentoring, "buddy system", teachers work together more	42	30%
Regular assistance from Program Department or Student Services staff	37	27%
Staff visit other units, schools, classrooms	31	23%
Workshops/Seminars	30	22%
Some staff did course (e.g., OISE, Ministry, external agency)	23	17%
Area curriculum day/Conference	19	14%
External resource people visit school/community involved with students	12	9%
Sub-committees,school committees	12	9%
Grade/division meetings, planning	10	7%
Team Planning	10	7%
Use Computer Centre resources-inservice	9	7%
Miscellaneous - (e.g., staffing changes, share resources with other schools, do presentation at York University, interaction with Faculty of Ed. students)	8	6%
Peer coaching	7	5%
Encourage/facilitate staff to visit class, attend conferences	7	5%
Liaison meeting with secondary/another school	5	4%
Central office meetings on subject/principals meet	5	4%
Study groups/user group meeting, club	3	2%
Curriculum discussions; curriculum team meetings	3	2%
Purchased support materials	2	1%
Increased staff membership in community group, activity	2	1%
Greater staff involvement, responsibilities	2	1%
Team teaching	1	1%
No Response	1	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 8

Problems in Implementing the Project	Frequency	Percent*
Resources:		
Time constraints - to discuss, share, plan; for inservice; for preparation time; to integrate	90	65%
Budget/financing constraints - need more money, "red tape" to get funding	42	30%
Materials constraints - lack of equipment, supplies; distribution; technical set up; access	40	29%
Human resources constraints - (e.g., training, need supply teachers, small staff)	39	28%
Human resources - Board personnel (e.g., lack of support, commitment from department; attitude of some Board staff; need more consultants in school)	5	4%
Staffing - class size too large	5	4%
Inservice - times: want in school hours; not enough; some duplication	5	4%
Staff:		
Resistance to change - fears, different comfort levels, concerns re: accountability	33	24%
Takes time to adjust, growth period - trying to do too much - need to balance everything; feel pressure of change	26	19%
Level of agreement among staff-reaching consensus - variety of teaching styles, philosophy	23	17%
Staff turnover - difficult to bring new people up to level; continuity	21	15%
Staff at different levels of expertise - at different stages - need to balance teacher knowledge and ability	13	9%
Perception of resource person - hard to define role across all grades/perception of team members	3	2%
Learning appropriate level of expectation for students/need benchmark of skills for each grade	2	1%
"Preparation" of students - readiness - didn't have skills/attitude required, before starting	2	1%
Difficulty in getting/choosing new text	1	1%
Community:		
Changing student population/nature of community/difficult type of school	11	8%
Parents' lack of interest - few parents who can/will help - community involvement difficult	7	5%
P.R., communication - conveying message to community	5	4%
Parents concerned - about disruption of academic program/re: teaching techniques, and evaluation	4	3%
Community resistance	1	1%
Organizational constraints:		
Arranging classrooms together, sharing equipment, needing more space, timetabling, physical environment	33	24%
Confusion, disorganization - communication difficult - maintaining focus; large staff	10	7%
Evaluation - guidelines, procedures	9	7%

Problems - Cont'd	Frequency	Percent
Other:		
Other projects interfered/delayed its starting; had to prioritize	9	7%
Difficult to define project - directions or focus unclear, conceptual difficulties, difficult to integrate	9	7%
Many competing demands for PA days - school needs control of own PA day time	7	5%
Need more leadership/direction/co-ordination	6	4%
Student behaviour, in different environment - discipline, concentration	4	3%
Political problems, pressures - (e.g., parents/teacher groups/ administration/ expectations too great)	3	2%
Need continuity through grades - consistency across Divisions	3	2%
None	3	2%
Students had difficulties with process, terminology, understanding	2	1%

* N.B. Percentages are in relation to the total group of responses (138 cases).

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 9

Changes in Classroom Practice	Frequency	Percent*
Teacher Attitude:		
New kinds of activities/better integration/cross-curricular focus/new applications/ teachers adding aspects to regular program	50	36%
Increased staff awareness - knowledge, understanding in area; more comfortable with subject	33	24%
Teacher-student relations improved - (e.g., recognize talents, ability; better communication; more empathy with student needs; teacher role changed)	23	17%
Change in staff attitudes - (e.g., more willing, more confidence, more comfortable with project)	22	16%
More willing and motivated to take risks	8	6%
Teacher self-knowledge - (e.g., it reassures, helps teacher evaluate what they are doing - change in personal philosophy towards project - more self-evaluation)	8	6%
Teacher Practice:		
Improved teaching techniques - (e.g., more activities, different approach more hands-on, child-centred; wider range of strategies used; teaching style changed)	53	38%
Staff relations - collaboration between teachers, supportive, sharing - more communication, openness	44	32%
Program - more balance, flexibility, directed - complement/integrate with/enhanced by project - fitted to student needs - different emphasis	43	31%
Student support, buddy system - collaboration; peer coaching; inter-grade exchange	33	24%
Better planning, organization - share, plan together	26	19%
Partnering, working together - more group work	21	15%
New kinds material, equipment used/used more often/revision of material	18	13%
Classroom organization - (e.g., furniture arrangement; work in different locations; more resources available in class; better use of materials)	17	12%
More/better integration (re: ESL, Special Ed.)	15	11%
More resource people used (e.g. from Program Department, Special Education Resource Teacher, educational assistants)	13	9%
Evaluation practices (student)-new, improved techniques - for tracking, monitoring, reporting to parents	9	7%
Computer used more as tool for learning/part of regular program	8	6%
Better use of resources (e.g., sharing materials, better availability, distribution)	7	5%
Developed co-operative learning - more co-op learning activities	6	4%
Teacher mentoring - peer coaching, partnering	6	4%
More individualized programming/multi-grade electives	4	3%
Organization of program/day - (e.g., choice of activity; more flexibility; more time in lab)	3	2%

Changes in Classroom Practice - (Cont'd)	Frequency	Percent*
Greater use of community resources	3	2%
More teacher observation; note-taking; new ways to observe	2	1%
Inter-grade exchange (teachers)/cross-grade groupings	2	1%
Every at-risk student served	1	1%
Student outcomes:		
Student social/personal interaction better - (e.g., co-operation, respect, tolerance , integrate, learn from each other, feel more secure, more confidence, improved self-esteem)	36	26%
Student behaviour improved/changed - (e.g., more responsible, involved, more independent, take risks, make decisions, less physical conflict, fewer discipline problems)	25	18%
Increased student awareness	22	16%
Change in student attitudes	21	15%
Developed student interest in new area/extra involvement/take initiative/motivated	17	12%
Student achievement better - (e.g., skills improved; quality of work better - more pride in work; increased teacher expectations)	16	12%
Miscellaneous - (e.g., more parental involvement, better use of space, none yet)	13	9%

* N.B. Percentages are in relation to the total group of responses (138 cases).

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 10

Other School Changes	Frequency	Percent*
Staff:		
Collaboration (plan together) - (e.g., time set for planning; collaborative approach; more team teaching; Divisions work more closely)	24	17%
Staff relations better-share ideas, staff input - more confidence, sense of purpose - teacher attitude changed	19	14%
Co-operation (work together) - (e.g., cross-division teaming, teacher mentoring)	18	13%
Staff showing leadership, involvement/whole staff involved/teachers have ownership, more control/more involved in decision-making	18	13%
Communication (talk together) - sharing, dialogue - improved communic. re: program needs - more communication with parents	12	9%
Professional development, inservice affected - e.g., teachers choose different topics, look for opportunity; regular meetings for staff development; more school-based staff development, use local expertise	10	7%
More student recognition - awards given; integration of students	9	7%
New kind of teacher knowledge developed and used - greater understanding of process - more interest in area	8	6%
Monitoring - regular meetings - "keep on top of needs" - more collaborative approach to tracking progress	6	4%
More empathy for the students; teacher expectations changed	6	4%
Role of librarian/chairperson changed - (e.g., do more, involved in different things; librarian not used for preparation time)	5	4%
More student/teacher contact time - more "equal" rapport, more friendly	3	2%
Students:		
In students - attitude, self-esteem - (e.g., take ownership, responsibility, take risks)	10	7%
More student choice, involvement - committed; more involved in decision-making; encourage student leadership	8	6%
Student behaviour - (e.g., less aggression; conflict resolution, peer mediation)	4	3%
Student relations better - more respectful; caring attitud	1	1%
Program:		
Programs - more/broader/enrichment - (e.g., more balanced; special focus; combination of activities, approaches; core expanded)	18	13%
New/different activities - (e.g., plays, assembly newsletter, students visit other classes, orientation)	15	11%
Share resources, material - new use of/more use of	12	9%
In program - changed technique, strategy	10	7%
More buddying, partnering activity - (e.g., cross- grade, older and younger students, twinning of classes, more interaction between divisions)	8	6%
Curriculum integration	4	3%
Evaluation - (e.g., methods shared, established norms)	3	2%

Other School Changes - (Cont'd)	Frequency	Percent*
Organizational:		
Budget - materials, equipment - allocation; increase; used more flexibly; a need for more	72	52%
Staffing - (e.g., extra teacher, core do more, new teachers motivated; use staff in new ways; supply teachers available; affects hiring practice)	38	28%
School organization - e.g.,physical change, set-up; created lab; location of resources; more combined grades; better use of resources	28	20%
School climate better; attitude, school morale	23	17%
Timetabling - change in/more flexible	12	9%
Additional resources acquired - (e.g., money for library books; staff demand for supportive materials)	10	7%
Fundraising activities, for cause - creative use of, to reward students	5	4%
Materials changed - (e.g., texts; use computer for prep time; new uses of equipment, applications)	5	4%
Staff meetings changed: (e.g.,fewer, more discussion, more direction; nature of project team meetings (re: who attends, who chairs)	5	4%
More awareness - less waste - better use of materials	4	3%
Community:		
Community involvement - (e.g., more parent input, involvement, support - use of volunteers, University students - community groups help)	19	14%
More liaison with other school, Secondary - more interaction between schools; share resources	4	3%
Miscellaneous - (e.g., involvement of Co-op and Faculty of Education students; prep time arranged around subject blocks; more credibility of Special Education teacher; SERT's serve more students; approach used for special event)	20	15%
No response	5	4%

* N.B. Percentages are in relation to the total group of responses (138 cases).

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 11

Anything CMTs Would Have Done Differently	Frequency	Percent
Planning/implementation stages - (e.g., inform teachers of their role, involvement; start from a different point; more planning time; set clearer goals; more structured plan; need timelines; narrow scope; inservice parents; streamline process)	43	31%
Staff training/prep - (e.g., more inservice; time for planning; need to focus staff; give more ownership; facilitate grade meetings; class visits; more training of team; inservice for new people)	39	28%
No	34	25%
Need a lot of staff input - involve more people; get consensuse on focus; staff should choose topic; provide more support for group dynamics; build staff cohesiveness	18	13%
Start sooner/decide earlier - speed up process	13	9%
Go more slowly - allow time for understanding process - more time required for planning; training, for "pilot"	13	9%
More resources - (e.g., curriculum guide; use more outside resources; more time, money, supply reachers; ensure materials available before start; use more effectively)	13	9%
Miscellaneous - (e.g., look at physical setting; set up sharing with other schools in similar project; continuity of staff importing would like to see results more quickly)	12	9%
Financing/budget consideration - (e.g., more equipment, full lab, bigger library)	9	7%
Took on too much - be realistic, consider narrower focus	7	5%
Better communication - with staff, community, parents - share ideas with everyone	7	5%
Involve Central resource person; have come in more often; more experts in school to help	7	5%
Use more of school resources - (e.g., devise own units; more team teaching; share expertise)	5	4%
Allow school its own PA days - more time for school-based staff development; more flexability in use of PA days	4	3%
Give more direction/re-align priorities	4	3%
Could try different approach, technique/need a different strategy	4	3%
Comprehensive teacher would like be more involved/librarian should be more involved	4	3%
Review/feedback process - (e.g., more formal evaluation; build in ways to evaluate states of project)	3	2%
Ensure new staff support it - include in hiring practices/hire different personalities	3	2%
Set up committee to handle project/help focus issues	2	1%
Principal would be more involved - give more authority	1	1%
Need more commitment from Program Department (e.g., resources, repairs)	1	1%
No response	1	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 12

Other Initiatives Happening in the Schools		
Initiative/Innovation	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Computers (lab, e.g., process writing, publishing, across-curriculum, increased use of)	57	41%
Community relations, outreach, involvement - (e.g., parent involvement, education; develop PTA group)	45	33%
Environmental concerns, awareness	37	27%
Miscellaneous	28	20%
Extra-curricular activities - (e.g., houseleague, teams, clubs, newsletter, play)	26	19%
Self-esteem	26	19%
Values Education - (e.g., co-operation, respect among students; non-competitiveness)	23	17%
Partners in Action	22	16%
Math project/program	22	16%
Special event	21	15%
Multiculturalism - (e.g., promote positive relations, cultural understanding)	18	13%
Language Arts project/program ; literacy; media	18	13%
Reading projects - (e.g., buddy reading, change basal reader)	16	12%
Conflict resolution - (e.g., discipline, safe schools, social skills)	16	12%
Staff development - (e.g., provide inservice program for new teachers; mentoring; change of teaching styles; school-based staff development)	16	12%
Daily Physical Education	14	10%
Liaison with Secondary/transition project; more feeder school involvement; core curriculum	14	10%
Co-operative Learning	13	9%
Science project/program; technology	13	9%
Music project/program	13	9%
Arts project/program	13	9%
Active Learning, Student-centred Learning	12	9%
Phys Ed. program/Outdoor Education	12	9%
Collaborative Learning - (e.g., pairing, buddying, peer coaching)	11	8%
Blueprint-related initiatives	11	8%
Collaboration - (e.g., between grades; French/English; in planning; team teaching; "collaborative culture"; plan for sharing resources)	11	8%
Health program - (e.g., drug program, parenting skills)	10	7%
Awards System/Student Recognition	10	7%
Enrichment - (e.g., co-ordinate activities with Area; more exposure to cultural activities)	9	7%
Partnering /buddying	9	7%

Other Initiatives Happening in the Schools - (Cont'd)		
Initiative/Innovation	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Reading Recovery	9	7%
Publishing house/centre	9	7%
Evaluation - (e.g., student evaluation techniques changed; reporting to parents; Benchmarks)	9	7%
Curriculum integration, cross-curriculum focus	9	7%
Revising curriculum guides/new curriculum materials/develop Division units	8	6%
Thinking skills	7	5%
Process writing	7	5%
Computerized report cards	7	5%
School spirit activities	7	5%
Integration - special education students, "special program" students	7	5%
Co-operative students/program	6	4%
School mission statement/review of school/school culture and climate	6	4%
"Personal growth" for students - (e.g., life skills, leadership, student council activities)	6	4%
Middle school philosophy	5	4%
Whole language	5	4%
Family grouping/combined grades/multi-age grouping/cross-grade teaching	5	4%
Theme approach/thematic units	4	3%
Guidance	4	3%
ESL - (e.g., support In-school Designate role in school; integration)	4	3%
Staff morale - (e.g., self-esteem, ownership)	4	3%
Inquiry learning/model	4	3%
Code of Behaviour - student discipline	4	3%
Balance of program choice for students/more variety	3	2%
Integration - immigrant students	2	1%
Learning styles	2	1%
Reorganize timetables	2	1%
No response	2	1%
French Immersion	1	1%
Enhance role of comprehensive teacher	1	1%
Problem-solving	1	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 13

Number of Initiatives for School	Frequency	Percent
6	24	17%
5	21	15%
4	18	13%
7	16	12%
11	10	7%
3	9	7%
8	9	7%
9	9	7%
10	8	6%
12	4	3%
13	4	3%
1	2	1%
2	2	1%
14	1	1%
18	1	1%
Total	138	100%

Table 14

Which Initiative Is the School's Highest Priority	Frequency	Percent
Major Curriculum Implementation Project	80	58%
Some project other than Curriculum Implementation Project.	39	28%
More than one	12	9%
Partial/highly related	5	4%
Uncertain/unknown	2	1%

Table 15

Why It Is a Priority	Frequency	Percent
It affects all else/everything is related to it/of most value/gives focus	52	38%
Increase student need; it fills a need	30	22%
Has greatest staff support, involvement - time, effort, resources invested; commitment	23	17%
No response	18	13%
Miscellaneous - (e.g., it requires less specialization; model was in place; an Area objective; think all are important; mandated by OSIS; practical, current; children enjoy it)	16	12%
Projects are complementary /similar emphasis	10	7%
Has positive effect on attitudes/climate/school activities	7	5%
All overlap, interrelated/all serve child/have some philosophy, goals	6	4%
Emphasis on skill development - practical, lifeskills	5	4%
To bring community groups together/community involvement	4	3%
It emphasizes curriculum	3	2%
It provides for leadership development, professional growth	2	1%
It relates to other projects, committee - can use it elsewhere	2	1%
Uses (modern) equipment/want to increase use	2	1%
Parents wanted it	1	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 16

Changes in Classroom Practice or in the School	Frequency	Percent*
Teacher Attitudes:		
New kinds of activities/better integration/cross-curricular focus/teachers adding aspects to regular program	34	25%
Increased staff awareness - (e.g., knowledge, understanding, comfort level)	18	13%
Teacher-student relations improved - (e.g., recognize talents, ability; co-operation, caring; more contacts between)	15	11%
Change in staff attitudes - (e.g., more willing, more confidence, more flexible	10	7%
Motivated to take risks (teachers)	1	1%
Teacher self-knowledge - (e.g., it reassures, helps teacher evaluate what doing; more self-evaluation occurring)	1	1%
Teacher Practice:		
Program - (e.g., more balance, flexibility, directed; complement/integrate with/ enhanced by project)	25	18%
Staff relations - (e.g., collaboration between teachers, support for new staff; peer coaching, work as a team, more sharing, more interaction, co-operation)	24	17%
Improved techniques (teaching practice) - (e.g., different approach, wider range of strategies used)	21	15%
More positive atmosphere, environment - (e.g., school spirit improved; better school apprearance)	18	13%
Student support, help, buddy system, partnerships, inter-grade exchange	16	12%
New kinds of material, equipment used/used more/revised material	15	11%
Partnering, work together - more co-operative activities, teamwork	10	7%
Better planning, organization - share, plan together	9	7%
More resource people used/available from program - specialists more in-class	9	7%
Sharing more materials - better availability, distribution, use of	6	4%
Organization of program/day - (e.g., more time in lab, flexibility, timetable change)	6	4%
More/better integration (ESL, Specical Education)	6	4%
Teachers involved in course/committees/more professional growth	6	4%
Student recognition, awards	6	4%
Use as tool for learning (computers)	5	4%
Evaluation practices (student) - (e.g., improved techniques; new tracking procedures; monitoring)	5	4%
More individualized programming/multi-grade electives/program modification	3	2%
Classroom organization - (e.g., furniture arrangement, work in different locations; more resources available in class)	3	2%

Changes in Classroom Practice or in the School - (Cont'd)	Frequency	Percent
Developed co-operative learning	1	1%
More teacher observation, record-keeping	1	1%
Student Outcomes:		
Student behaviour improved - (e.g., more responsible, independent, take risks, make decisions - less physical conflict)	32	23%
Student social/personal interaction better - (e.g., co-operation, respect, tolerance - feel more secure, confidence, self-esteem)	28	20%
Change in student attitudes - (e.g.,sense of satisfaction, "settled")	27	20%
Developed student interest, extra involvement - more input, opportunity for leadership	21	15%
Increased student awareness	17	12%
Skill development-new, more applications	13	9%
Student achievement better/academic standards improved	5	4%
Community:		
More community involvement/understanding - (e.g., parent support; more communication with community; share activities with other schools)	36	26%
Miscellaneous - (e.g., new resources acquired; less waste of resources; use PD day to collect suggestions; extra staff to enable more remedial classes)	12	9%
No response	2	1%

Table 17

Relationship Between Implementation Project and Other Initiatives	Frequency	Percent
Complementary, integrated	124	93%
Some overlap/integration	12	9%
Affects everything in school	6	5%
Competitive	3	2%
No response	4	3%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 18

Do You Have a Team That Deals With Curriculum Matters	Frequency	Percent
Yes	122	88%
Other - uncertain/unaware of/not solely for curriculum	8	6%
No	5	4%
No response	3	2%

Table 19

Name of Curriculum Management Team	Frequency	Percent
CMT/curriculum planning team/CRDI Team/Curriculum Committee	76	55%
Administrative team/school management team/leadership team/school support team	30	22%
No response	12	9%
No name	11	8%
Other - "staff committee", divisional team, whole staff	8	6%
"Cabinet"	1	1%

Table 20

Number of People on Team	Frequency	Percent
Unknown - (unclear, re: exact number)	30	22%
5	29	21%
4	27	20%
3	19	14%
6	19	14%
No response	4	3%
7	4	3%
2	2	1%
8	2	1%
9	2	1%

Table 21

Curriculum Management Team Members		
Position of Team Members	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Principal	122	88%
Chairpersons	116	84%
Teachers	73	53%
Vice-Principal	61	44%
LRC/Librarian	25	18%
SERT/Special Education Representative	15	11%
Unknown position	13	9%
Whole staff	11	8%
ESL	6	4%
Guidance	4	3%
No response	2	1%
Division Representative	1	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 22

How Members Were Chosen	Frequency	Percent
Due to position, role	57	41%
Interest/volunteer	42	30%
No response	33	24%
Selected by Principal/appointed/request/by invitation	26	19%
By staff election	3	2%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 23

Role of Principal		
Role	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Facilitate, co-ordinate	62	45%
Support, encourage	61	44%
Catalyst, initiate, visionary - start project, give direction, develop collaborative environment	55	40%
Provide resources - (e.g., time, budget, arrange inservice, supply teacher coverage)	51	37%
Provide Leadership - direction, focus, conflict resolution, mentor	42	30%
Motivate/get staff committment	14	10%
Oversee projects - monitor, evaluate	12	9%
Liaison with parent groups, inform other staff	9	7%
Equal role, no special function	9	7%
Expertise in CRDI/project area - has knowledge of process; interpret Board guidlines...	9	7%
Chair Committee	8	6%
Communicate information from Program Department, conferences - attend meetings; give direction from Board, Ministry	6	4%
See in broader perspective - long range plan, school/Area objectives	3	2%
Set goals per school needs - (e.g., build on previous school history, achievements, characteristics)	2	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 24

Role of Vice-Principal		
Role	**Frequency**	**Percent**
No Vice-Principal at school	65	47%
Supportive - give recognition	26	19%
Facilitate, collaborate	26	19%
Co-ordinates - arrange meetings, organize, schedule, make contacts	23	17%
Provide, arrange resources	16	12%
Liaison, communicate with staff and students, with Program and Area	15	11%
Provides perspective, per school operations - gives direction	7	5%
Role model/catalyst	7	5%
Chair meetings - on committees	5	4%
Equal role/no special role	5	4%
Help lay groundwork/provide focus - has background, expertise	4	3%
Work with the teachers - demonstrate, do roposal staff development	4	3%
Attend workshop, give presentation - do inservice	4	3%
Evaluate role - monitor, oversee, do teacher evaluation	3	2%
Not involved	3	2%
No response	2	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 25

Role of Chairperson		
Role	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Leadership - model, lead workshop, develop strategies, share expertise, do presentation, part of decision-making	77	56%
Communication - (e.g., listen, liaison with staff, educate parents, express needs)	77	56%
Facilitate/co-ordinate - acquire resources, organize, support objectives	73	53%
Implementation - (e.g., give direction, work with teachers, help integrate, focus)	39	28%
As a resource - organize	24	17%
Staff development - plan, evaluate, encourage, provide	23	17%
Motivate, encourage, change, supportive, recommend new practice	18	13%
Equal role/special role	7	5%
Initiated one aspect	6	4%
Not involved	3	2%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 26

Role of Teachers		
Role	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Communicate, share ideas, liaison, give input, feedback, "staff representative"	76	56%
Model/leader - (e.g., encourage others; organize staff meetings, course development, work with teachers, promote project)	69	50%
As resource - (e.g., help plan, assist others, facilitate contact resource people, arrange inservice, gather resources)	59	43%
Implementation	38	28%
Not involved	11	8%
Take inservice - opportunity to learn; generate new ideas	9	7%
Chair project committees/lead planning group	9	7%
Make presentations/lead workshop/train student assistant	9	7%
No response	9	7%
Try new techniques	7	5%
Write/edit proposal, policy - develop survey: on writing committee	6	4%
Equal/no special role	3	2%
Manage job	2	2%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 27

Role of Superintendent		
Role	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Support, encourage, facilitate - (e.g., promote, community relations, "secondary board")	112	81%
Provide resources - (e.g., money, direction, PD, staffing, curriculum material, time to meet)	62	45%
Arrange Area activities - (e.g., PA day, CRDI day, Area chairs meeting; co-ordinate Area objectives; encourage sharing, liaison)	54	39%
Monitor project - visit, discuss, oversee, prioritize, encourage focus of objectives	32	23%
Arrange meetings with Chairs, VPs, Principal group; consult with principal; help initiate	31	23%
Ensure appropriate curriculum knowledge when hiring; help with school staffing, and teacher evaluation	28	20%
School reviews - (e.g., emphasis on curriculum, help identify needs, suggest direction)	24	17%
Promote sharing of ideas/create atmosphere of collaboration - provide philosophy, promote leadership to effect change	23	17%
Help resolve problems, smooth way - (e.g., careful re. school load; liaison with Board)	23	17%
Not involved closely - very broad role	6	4%
Help reflect, evaluate - provide alternative perspective	5	4%
Encourage parent association - communicate with	5	4%
Instructional Leader	5	4%
No response	4	3%
Conflict management	3	2%
Not involved	2	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 28

Communication with Staff		
Communicate	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Informal discussions/social events	110	80%
Regular staff meeting/planning meeting	91	66%
In written form - memo, calendar, newsletter	62	45%
Division meeting/grade Level meeting	41	30%
Informal staff meetings/small group meetings	28	20%
Project committee meetings/curriculum sessions	28	20%
Posted/announcement/instruction to staff/surveys	16	12%
PA day, inservices, Area conferences	15	11%
Assemblies/presentations/workshops	11	8%
Staff send ideas to administrative team/through chairs, principal	9	7%
Informal mentoring - peer coaching	5	4%
Special lunch/event/speaker	4	3%
N/A - they are the same	4	3%
Class visits	2	1%
No response	2	1%
Not directly	1	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 29

Do You Have a Curriculum Management Plan for Your School	Frequency	Percent
Yes	87	63%
Other: partially, guidelines, general plan/other related plans	27	20%
No	24	17%

Table 30

Describe Your Plan		
Plan Content	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Objectives, rationale	68	49%
Steps to implement, action plan, strategy	49	36%
Timelines	48	35%
No response	42	30%
Evaluation/monitoring/review	24	17%
Staff development/inservice for parents, community	18	13%
Themes, activities, guidelines	15	11%
Resources	13	9%
Adaptation of document (e.g., Blueprint, Three Steps Toward Success)	9	7%
Needs	6	4%
Use model - (e.g., of srategic planning; of enrichment teachers; of the project)	6	4%
Outcomes	3	2%
Area plan	1	1%
Staff presentations, input	1	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 31

Is There a Written Plan	Frequency	Percent
Yes	69	50%
Other: not in detail/partial/unknown	34	25%
No	30	22%
No response	5	4%

Table 32

How Plan Was Created		
Plan Created	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Co-operatively, all staff contributed - (e.g., discussion, division meetings, ongoing staff input)	52	38%
Team wrote/planned it, with staff input/approval/refinement	45	33%
It evolved - from previous year; influenced by other activity	24	17%
At Area PD day/curriculum conference, curriculum management meeting, June PA day	21	15%
Staff identified need	19	14%
No response	17	12%
In staff development - from inservice	9	7%
With (assistance of) Program Department resource personnel	8	6%
Used Board/Ministry documents to help	5	4%
From pilot project	3	2%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 33

Staff Development Component of Plan		
Type of Staff Development	**Frequency**	**Percent**
No response	59	43%
Encourage/allow time to attend conference, inservice, courses	30	22%
Board inservices, courses, conference	30	22%
Encourage use of school staff expertise - (e.g., give inservice, share PD experience, share knowledge, modelling, peer coaching)	20	15%
Use PA days/take control of PD	18	13%
Specific inservice for staff	11	8%
Board support staff work with small groups/in school regularly	11	8%
Area curriculum conferences/meetings/Area plan/network with Area staff	10	7%
Visit other schools to see; share materials, resources	9	7%
Consultant/Board expert/Program head helps often	8	6%
All staff involved in writing - (e.g., objectives, planning, collaborative planning; write in teams)	6	4%
Ongoing - regular inservice, workshops	6	4%

Staff Development Component of Plan - (Cont'd)		
Type of Staff Development	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Not formal - as available/needed, requested	4	3%
Principal meets with other schools in same project/school is partnered with school	4	3%
Informal discussions	2	1%
Chairpersons' conference	2	1%
Staff are on committees (e.g., Area, city)	2	1%
Staff excursions to see resources available	2	1%
Evening with parents	1	1%
Done though evaluation, questionnaire	1	1%
CMT had planning session	1	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed.
Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 34

How Plan Was Amended		
Plan Amended Through:	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Staff evaluates - discussion, input, small working group	68	49%
Modify according to needs	51	37%
Ongoing evaluation, informal - on regular basis, continual review	42	30%
Year-end evaluation - evaluate annually	24	17%
Revised by committee/team discusses	24	17%
Staff meeting - curriculum, planning	20	15%
No response	10	7%
Parent input - (e.g., survey/community input)	9	7%
Don't know yet; too early; not that far yet	4	3%
With help from Program Department Staff/their direction	4	3%
Fit school objectives with Area and Director's/plan adjusted by system initiatives	3	2%
GAP analysis	3	2%
Special workshop/Area PD day	2	1%
Student council has input	1	1%
From standardized tests' results, see needs	1	1%
Feedback from school review	1	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed.
Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

TABLE 35

Projects You Would Like to Initiate in the Future		
Future Initiatives	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Continue with present/don't know	41	30%
Math project - (e.g., Family, Math, problem-solving)	27	20%
Miscellaneous - (e.g., Outdoor Ed., improve preparation time, research skills, learning styles, streamline extra-curricular, revamp awards system, enrichment activities)	26	19%
Staff development - school-based; more Program Staff in; visit other classrooms; inservice time during day; personal development	22	16%
Develop community liaison/involvement - (e.g., more parent involvement; translate materials)	19	14%
Computers in classroom/lab/literacy - better use of, increased use	19	14%
Environmental initiatives - (e.g., recycling, Ecology fair)	16	12%
Daily Phys.Ed/fitness/co-ed Phys.Ed./co-operative games	15	11%
Collaborative approach/teaching/planning	15	11%
Values education	14	10%
Conflict resolution - (e.g., safe schools, peer mediation, family violence)	13	9%
ESL - (e.g., how best to help; content in drama; strategies; evaluation; ESL component within project)	13	9%
Student evaluation - (e.g., testing; Benchmarks; basic skills)	12	9%
A language arts program/project - (e.g., effective writing; oral language development)	12	9%
Science project	10	7%
More effective programming - (e.g., curriculum concerns, quality programming, less disruption, better delivery system)	7	5%
Strategic planning - (e.g., develop Mission Statement)	6	4%
Reading project	6	4%
Multicultural project	6	4%
Regular group planning time/time to work stratigies	6	4%
Co-operative learning	5	4%
Liaison with Secondary/feeders/Transition Years	5	4%
Blueprint	5	4%
Thinking skills	5	4%
Technology project	5	4%
Whole language	5	4%
Integrated theme approach/cross-division initiatives/more school units/integrate projects with other areas	5	4%
Publishing house/newsletters	4	3%
Process writing	4	3%

Projects You Would Like to Initiate - (Cont'd)		
Future Initiatives	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Activity-based learning/active learning - discovery learning	4	3%
Guidance project	4	3%
Partners in action/library resource centre as focal point	3	2%
Create a curriculum/curriculum guidelines	3	2%
Arts project	3	2%
Evaluation of program - accountability	3	2%
Collaborative learning	2	1%
Code of Behaviour	2	1%
No response	2	1%
Drug program	1	1%
Reading Recovery	1	1%
Literacy program	1	1%
Integration - ESL, Special Education	1	1%
Better staff communication	1	1%
Middle school philosophy	1	1%
Mentor monitoring system	1	1%
Student orientation program	1	1%
P.R., marketing	1	1%
Re-evaluate teaching styles, determine whether meet student needs	1	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response catergory should be considered as an independent item.

Table 36

Suggested System Initiatives for Program or Other Board Departments	Frequency	Percent*
Resources:		
More support personnel from Program,subject specialists, ensure availability of TSA's	25	18%
More money for projects,for staff development, for materials	23	17%
Supply teachers/time for attending conference/planning time	14	10%
Curriculum guides-improved format, more practical	14	10%
Support - for community involvement, school requests, transportation, group planning time	12	9%
Create a program/study; assistance with a program, staff training	11	8%
More help from Student Services; co-ordination between Program and Student Services	10	7%
Parenting skills/life skills course	2	1%
PA day for report cards	1	1%
Safe schools	1	1%
In-school Guidance	1	1%
Staff development:		
Provide PA days for school use, school-based staff development	50	36%
Inservice on computers, P.R., math, Blueprint; base on needs and interests, better co-ordination, more specific	24	17%
School-based curriculum development, management - more support for school decision-making	14	10%
Look at staffing problems - (e.g., class size too large; consider program needs of school; North vs South schools)	8	6%
Help schools with strategic planning, the change process, collaboration, positive school culture	5	4%
Area meetings (time for)-elementary/secondary meetings - for planning curriculum management	5	4%
Consider staff morale - (e.g., support teachers to become risk-takers; continue work on self-esteem)	3	2%
Planning:		
No more/too many initiatives - lessen pressure, expectations; slow down, facilitate, not initiate	20	15%
Co-ordinate initiatives, programs - timing of events, demands; Co-ordinate Department's, solidify priorities	14	10%
Common focus across Board, Departments - (e.g., more emphasis on certain area; cross-curric. teaching; a major thrust, focus; a unified philosophy)	12	9%
More awareness of large ESL population, impact on programs - help teachers deal with needs; program modifications design	11	8%
Assessment/evaluation (curriculum) - (e.g., evaluation tools for process; review a program; basic skills)	10	7%
Support for new emphasis in subject area - (e.g., Math and Science skills/extend project approach to other grades)	3	2%
Long-range planning - align with staff development calendar	2	1%
Communication:		
More liaison between schools in projects - share ideas, experience - time to meet, visit; create networking	14	10%
Better communication between departments - and with schools	11	8%
P.R.- educate public about changed image of Senior schools, what school system provides	7	5%
Miscellaneous - (e.g., too many special weeks/days; re-evaluate busing policy; decentralize resources; upgrade facilities; create English language policy; re - evaluate promotion process)	32	23%
No response	3	2%

* N.B. Percentages are in relation to the total group of responses (138 cases).

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 37

Types of Support Required from Program Department	Frequency	Percent*
Money:		
Money - for resources, staff development, program, library, school initiatives; decentralize funds; change method for allotting	93	67%
Staff Development (A): Inservice		
Inservice, workshops - during day more integrated; more opportunity for peer coaching; specific conference	26	19%
Share, promote information re. successful projects - enable teachers to visit	7	5%
Staff Development (B): Consultative Service		
Continued/increased/change in support - (e.g., Program staff consult during collaborative planning; more efficient use of central support staff, more follow-up, and classroom assistance; staff development opportunities)	57	41%
Resource personnel, more subject specialists - available when needed	33	24%
Staff Development (C): Time		
Supply teachers/staffing/release time	45	33%
Time - to visit, plan, share ideas, give inservice	40	29%
Resources:		
Specific resources - (e.g., guidelines, resource list, supportive research, advertise inservices better, update film and video selection	42	30%
Administrative (A): Policy		
Let schools develop own initiatives - school-based staff development; school PA days-control of, format; trust in teachers, and Principal	34	25%
Re-structure Program Department - less subject specialized; new staffing; reflect curric. priorities	10	7%
A staff development Centre	5	4%
Less pressure, expectations - too many projects	3	2%
Review structure of Departments, to reflect cross-curriculum emphasis	3	2%
Policy - (e.g., language teaching)	2	1%
Administrative (B): Organizational		
Different use of consultants/support staff - more time in classroom; assign to family of schools	17	12%
Group schools with same CRDI projects - facilitate networking, share expertise	6	4%
Better planning for new initiatives/timing during year not good	3	2%
Group similar schools for curriculum development/share resources	2	1%
Administrative (C): Liaison with other Departments		
Staffing - (e.g., need more liaison with Personnel re: staffing in PA school)	5	4%
Better co-ordination with Student Services	3	2%
Principals' meeting, share CRDI initiatives	1	1%
Networking with other Boards	1	1%
Miscellaneous - (e.g., new approach to testing; review excursion policy; approval for conferences to team members; better document distribution method)	20	15%
No response	3	2%

* N.B. Percentages are in relation to the total group of responses (138 cases).

+ N.B. The figures in the table do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 38

Other System Changes Needed to Facilitate CRDI	Frequency	Percent*
Resources:		
Resources - supply teachers, money, computers, more support, staff, re-allocate resources	36	26%
Time for elementary/Secondary liaison; facilitate information sharing - between Divisions schools	30	22%
Lots of support, all kinds - (e.g., Co-ordinators should approach schools more often; more help for new teachers; support to Librarians)	13	9%
Budget - (e.g., base on fiscal year, more money for resources; separate money for communications; decentralize money for teacher conferences)	8	6%
Clarify role of consultant - (e.g., more TSA's in school; impact on staffing)	7	5%
Allow lots of time for it - several years - "reasonable" timeline	6	4%
Staffing - mobility/more staff/appropriate placement per skills	6	4%
Curriculum guidelines - (e.g., more follow-up, inservice;particular ideas for document implementation; too many new ones)	5	4%
Smaller class size/pupil-teacher ratio	4	3%
Computerize elementary school offices	2	1%
Change report cards - to match objectives for new initiatives	1	1%
Have someone in charge of integrated studies	1	1%
PA/Staff Development:		
School-based PA day - school control; more attention to school concerns; more flexibility	24	17%
PA day structure (e.g., elementary and Secondary same day); day time inservices; rearranging timing (e.g., blocks of time); link families of schools	18	13%
Staff education & support - (e.g., provide more planning days; simplify CRDI process; give feedback to teachers, inservice on CRDI; help understand research findings)	11	8%
Staff development - (e.g., set up a centre; inservice for CMT's; broader access to conference)	10	7%
Grade level meetings/arrange meetings, inservice for Chairpersons	3	2%
Acknowledge key teachers - support leadership; promote mentoring	3	2%
Change in teacher philosophy - (e.g., collaboration)	2	1%
Have workshop out of school time, different setting - staff retreats	2	1%
Area curriculum conference useful	1	1%
Gather wide range of PD ideas	1	1%
Co-ordination:		
Co-ordinate initiatives - (e.g., timing, philosophy; all schools do same project; have Area theme; connect schools with common initiatives)	17	12%
Co-ordinate all of support network - (e.g., house together; co-ordinate Dept's; work more closely together; have coherent policies)	9	7%
Reorganize Program Department - (e.g., more integration; reallocate centrally-assigned people; better use of staff)	7	5%

Other System Changes Needed - (Cont'd)	Frequency	Percent
Administrative-streamline paper tasks	1	1%
Arrange sports events within family of schools	1	1%
Program:		
Have fewer initiatives - slow, less pressure; be more selective; focus on 1 or 2 areas; share knowledge	14	10%
More school freedom, independence to choose projects - less mandating - allow flexibility, ownership; school-based planning	13	9%
ESL needs - (e.g., increase funding and staffing; help teachers cope with students)	4	3%
Examine evaluation & reporting system - should tie implementation closely to evaluation; review programs for future direction	3	2%
Trust in professionalism of teachers	2	1%
More awareness of regional differences/recognize school differences	2	1%
Reinstate a program (Artfax)	1	1%
Assistance:		
Assistance with - program evaluation, new teachers, sharing information; awareness of CRDI roles; networking of teachers in projects; teacher understanding of process; how to involve parents more	15	11%
Direction - re: priorities, pressures, how to co-ordinate activities; clear guidelines re: school-based curriculum development; more long-term planning	10	7%
Make all Departments accessible	2	1%
Miscellaneous - (e.g., better communication with schools and parents; inservice for Principals re: recognize staff strengths; Mission Statement; review event weeks; public education re: value of PA days)	21	15%
No response	10	7%

* N.B. Percentages are in relation to the total group of responses (138 cases).

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 39

Additional Comments	Frequency	Percent
Miscellaneous - (e.g., less reactionary approach to planning; consider varied needs of schools; should provide planning time; CRDI expectations difficult for sma.l school; more use of school resources)	53	38%
No response	29	21%
Is a useful process/would like feedback about interview/how will results be used	24	17%
Need more resources - (e.g., consultants specialized staff; materials; list of resources; supply teacher coverage; funding for excurions, Spec. Ed.)	17	12%
Process helped staff reflect on strengths/changes, growth/provides a forum for discussion	11	8%
Facilitate sharing between schools with similar focus; time for Area schools to work together; promote use of expertise within Board	10	7%
Teachers are key element in making project effective - be sensitive to stress of change, provide support; staff very involved, worked co-operatively	9	7%
Too many initiatives - much pressure - shouldn't displace school's prior activities	9	7%
Inservice very important - want more/different kind/for team leaders/ on evaluation skills for teachers	6	4%
Program evaluation/review concerns - need guidelines, how to review curriculum implementation	6	4%
Provide common direction for system - identify priorities, co-ordinate	5	4%
Staffing problems, from CRDI - (e.g., in small school, spread thin - need experts)	5	4%
Need more co-ordination between Student Services & Program - more integration, common direction, more communication between departments	5	4%
School-based staff development - (e.g., opportunity to learn, take leadership)	4	3%
Community involvement important - would like to involve parents more/have had good relationships	4	3%
Should give more recognition of successful CRDI project	4	3%
Teachers frustrated re. children have many needs - can we meet them?	4	3%
Teachers' workload huge, difficult to do all effectively - need time for meetings, prep, inservice	4	3%
Group enjoyed interview, process - enthusiastic	3	2%
Promote understanding of link between: objectives and evaluation process; classroom and system CRDI process	3	2%
Shared ownership is important	2	1%
Area conference excellent/Area meetings to discuss CRDI very useful - planning time, sharing	2	1%
Team approach works well - shared responsibility	2	1%
Want more school autonomy - localize control over implementation	2	1%
Need Staff Development Centre/work with Federation to facilitate teacher growth	2	1%
Principal support very important	2	1%
ESL component significant factor - affects many things - staffing and support	2	1%
School physical environment should be improved - space a problem	2	1%
Concern about class size	2	1%
Focused Interview process not useful	1	1%
Use CRDI model at classroom level	1	1%
Need community adult literacy program	1	1%
Would like to see policy on (subject) methodology, approach	1	1%
Board should provide vehicle for educators to communicate concerns	1	1%

+ N.B. The figure in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

Table 40

Observations by Interviewers	Frequency	Percent
No response	41	30%
Team feeling among staff - work together, supportive, collaborative	29	21%
Miscellaneous - (e.g., school successful in change process, staff not aware of resources available; a dual track school; computer Centre resources were critical to success - difficult to keep focused)	27	20%
Everyone open, honest, comfortable	20	15%
Everyone contributed, prepared	17	12%
See evidence of commitment, ownership, proud of work	16	12%
Principal dominated interview	14	10%
Teachers participated little/one teacher dominated	8	6%
Group seemed unaware of appropriate terminology, CRDI concepts/not understand process	8	6%
Members supported focused interview process, found useful; project was meaningful	6	4%
Staff too well prepared-seemed orchestrated; used notes	5	4%
Recognition given, appreciation evident	4	3%
Some anxiety, hesitation to respond	4	3%
Administrators new to school	4	3%
Chairperson answered large section	3	2%
Observed school problem - (e.g., staff frustration; affected by frequent turnover)	3	2%
They need a plan, or a team - lack of clear direction, focus	3	2%
Superintendent dominated	2	1%
Principal seems to be decision-maker - leader, set tone	2	1%
Trying to impress Associate Superitendent	1	1%
Teachers involved in: curriculum planning	1	1%
Supt. seems to compare schools	1	1%
Supt. interfered/presence hindered discussion	1	1%
Principal has special training, background for project	1	1%
Some defensiveness	1	1%
This is a Program-assisted school	1	1%
No teacher input(absent)	1	1%
Principal/staff lacked enough information, understanding of process	1	1%
No leadership/no communication among team	1	1%

+ N.B. The figures in the tables do not add up to 100% as multiple responses were allowed. Each response category should be considered as an independent item.

APPENDIX D

Human Resources Used to Assist School in Their Projects[1]

Name	Position/Dept./Institution (in '90-91)	Subject Area in Which They Helped
Patrick Abthan	Agincourt C.I.	Computers
Mike Adams		
Neil Andersen	Computers in Education	Computers
Ken Andrews	TSA	Environmental Awareness
Joe Arbuthnott	Guidance Chair (School)	Middle School Model
Lianne Attersley	TSA, Program Department	Active Student Centred Learning Co-operative Learning
Marika Ball	Area Enrichment	Thinking Skills
Elaine Bandermann	TSA, Program Department	Language Project Whole Language
Bob Barton	External Consultant	Language Literacy Based Program Drama
John Bebbington	TSA, Program Department	Active Student Centred Learning English Language Project Co-op Learning Transition Years Pilot Project Creative Thinking Blueprint
Jenny Bennett	Enrichment Teacher	Inquiry Learning Thinking Skills
John Bennett	Ministry Natural Resources	Environment Awareness
Ron Benson	Co-ordinator, Program Department	Active Student Centred Learning Whole Language Language Project Math Language Arts Policy English Language Project
Wendy Berner	University of Calgary	Drama
Heidi Birhart		Creative Thinking
Michelle Borba	External Consultant	Self-esteem Activity Centred Learning Partners in Action
Joyce Bridget		Environmental Awareness
Kim and Gerry Brodie		Environmental Awareness

[1] Unfortunately, the interview records did not always include sufficient information to complete this chart. We have tried to ensure its accuracy and regret any omissions.

Human Resources Used to Assist Schools in Their Projects - (Cont'd)

Name	Position/Dept./Institution (in '90-91)	Subject Area in Which They Helped
Ian Brown	(Psychology) Student Services	Blueprint Self-esteem
Nancy Bruno	Student Services	SLD Teacher Blueprint
Karen Buck		Environmental Awareness
Marge Burns	Area Enrichment	Problem Solving, creative thinking Environmental Awareness Blueprint "School-Designed" project Thinking Skills
Linda Cameron	TSA, Program Department	Drama Literacy Based Program Whole Language
Ann Carmichael	Library Resource Teacher	Literacy Based Program
Lois Cavesco		Drama
Judy Clarke	Values Education	Guidance Co-op Learning Values Across Curric./ Inquiry Learning Values Ed. Project Active Student Centred Learning Blueprint
Val Copeland	TSA, Program Department	Drama English Curriculum
Jan Cornwall	TSA, Program Department	Active Student Centred Learning Language Project Math
Rick Couch	Counsellor	Guidance
Bob Cowan	Student Services (itinerant)	Enhancing Self-esteem Activity Centred Learning Partners in Action
Carol Cox	Student Community Services	Thinking Skills
Frank Crow		Computers
Chief Dan George family		Environmental Awareness
George Dealhoy	(V.P.)	Middle School Model
Paula Dotey	TSA, Program Department	Thinking Skills
Scarlett Draper		
Danila Duliunas	TSA, Program Department	Active Student Centred Learning
Sonia Dunn		Literacy Based Program
Lorna Earl	Research Director, Program Department	Transition Years Pilot Project

Human Resources Used to Assist Schools in Their Projects - (Cont'd)

Name	Position/Dept./Institution (in '90-91)	Subject Area in Which They Helped
Connie Edwards	External Consultant	Active Student Centred Learning
Walter Egan		Environmental Awareness
Judy Ellis	USA Speaker	Computers
Chris Evans	Artist	Music Wheels Environmental Awareness Creative Thinking
Melanie Exner	Student Services (itinerant teacher)	SLD
Shirley Fairfield	(Math) Area Enrichment Teacher	Math Active Student Centred Learning Literacy Based Program Computers Thinking Skills
Doris Ferguson	Community Liaison Counsellors	
Kathy Flagler		Inquiry Learning Process
Kathy Fraser		
Don Garratt	Co-ordinator, Program Department	
Dianne Gillies	Student Services	Guidance
Liz Gilliland		Ecology
Rollit Goldring	Superintendent of Program	Transition Years Pilot Project
Gibb Goodfellow	Ministry of Education	
Ron Gough	Student and Community Services	Blueprint
Neil Graham	Ministry of Education	
Andy Hargreaves	OISE	Transition Years Pilot Project
Lois Healey	Program	Language/Reading Co-op Learning
Emily Hearn	Author	English Language Project
Sybil Hoffman	Student Services	Blueprint
Mark Holmes	OISE	Blueprint
Maxine Howell	Area Enrichment Teacher	Co-op Learning
Mima Hoyes	External	Drama
Keith Hubbard	Coordinator, Program Department	Strategic School Planning Transition Years Pilot Project
Doug Inkpen	(School)	Reading English Curriculum
Peter Jackson		Computers

Human Resources Used to Assist Schools in Their Projects - (Cont'd)

Name	Position/Dept./Institution (in '90-91)	Subject Area in Which They Helped
Bob Jennings		Drama
Ruth Johnson	Author	Environmental Awareness
Patsy Jordan	Counsellor	Guidance
Bob Kerr	Assoc. Superintendent, Planning	Middle School Model
Solveig Lalla	Student Services	
Don L'Amoureux		Computers
Lucie LePage	French Teacher (school)	Bilingual Aspect
Jill Liberty	TSA, Program Department	Language Project Whole Language
Peter Lipman	CRDI Project Director,Program Department	Guidance School Strategies Computers Activity Based Learning Blueprint Co-op Learning Thinking Skills Mission Statement
Linda Loth	TSA, Student Services	Guidance Middle School Model
Doug MacMillan	TSA, Program Department	Values Guidance Co-op Learning Drama
Susan Macpherson	Administrative Assistant, Program Department	School Strategic Planning
Joe Malinowski	TSA, Program Department	Science is Happening Here Environment Awareness
Howard Markovitch	Psychologist, Student Services	
Murray Matheson	Math Teacher	Co-op Small Group Learning
Allyson McClelland	V.P. (School)	Math Mission Statement
Bob McConnell	Coordinator, Program Department	
Malcolm McLean	S.O.E.S.	Outdoor Ed.
Sharon McLeod	Computers	CRDI
Jim McMillan		Environmental Awareness
Frances McShane		Drama
Liz Mitchell		
David Morris	Artist	Historical Reproductions

Human Reseources Used to Assist Schools in Their Projects - (Cont'd)

Name	Position/Dept./Institution (in '90-91)	Subject Area in Which They Helped
Sue Murdoch	TSA, Program Department	Blueprint Whole Language Active Student Centred Learning
Walter Murray		(Define Internal Communication Process)
Debbie Nyman	School	Drama
Ed Nosko	Chair (School)	Math
Ken O'Connor	Co-ordinator, Program Department	Environmental Awareness Inquiry Learning
Bonnie O'Donoghue	Assistant Coordinator, Program Department	Language Project
Sue Parks	TSA, Program Department	(Lang.) Reading Resources English Language Program Inquiry Learning Computers Whole Language
Les Parsons	TSA, Program Department	Active Student Centred Learning English Curric.
Linda Parsons	Administrative Assistant Student Services	Blueprint Self-esteem
Bill Peel	TSA, Program Department	Computers
Sandi Penziwol	Teacher	Contemporary Classroom
Donna Petznick		Computers
Cathy Phillips	TSA, Program Department	CRDI Computers English Language Project
Linda Pogue	North York Board	Drama Active Learning
Dave Pollard	Teacher	Small Group Co-op Learning
Len Popp	Brock University	Inquiry Learning Thinking Skills
Linda Quinlan		Literacy Based Program
Laura Quan	Community Liaison Counsellor	
Rick Rimar	Chair (School)	Math
Don Robb	Associate Supertendent, Program	
Gary Schallenberg	External	Drama
Betty Skilbeck	Area Enrichment Teacher	Active Learning Thinking Skills English Language Project
Nancy Sewards	Area Enrichment Teacher	Creative Thinking

Human Resources Used to Assist Schools in Their Projects - (Cont'd)

Name	Position/Dept./Institution (in '90-91)	Subject Area in Which They Helped
Maureen Skinner	TSA, Program Department	Whole Language Active Student Centred Learning
Don Snow	Vice Principal (School)	Environmental Awareness
Bill Stadnyk	Co-ordinator, Program Department	Discipline-Based Art Education
Michael Stubitsch	Assistant Co-ordinator, Program Department	Drama
Pauline Thornton	Student Services (itinerant)	Enhancing Self-esteem Activity Centred Learning Partners in Action
Mark Thurman	Author	Whole Language
Peter Tilston	CAP	Blueprint Self-esteem School Strategic Planning
Don Veno	Guidance Chair	Guidance
Elaine Wilkes	TSA. Program Department	Blueprint
Rick Williams		Computers
Diane Wilson	TSA, Program Department	Active Student Centred Learning Blueprint
Judy Woodhouse	Teacher	Small Group Co-op Learning
Jacquie Wurtenberg	External Consultant	Staff Development
Paul Zolis	Coordinator, Program Department	Math

<u>Institutions/Groups</u>

TVO

Ontario Science Centre Staff

Pre-School Discoveries

Scarborough Elementary Teachers' Association

APPENDIX E

Material Resources Used to Assist Schools in Their Projects

Name of Resource

Apple Works
Beaglewrite
Barb Colorossa Tapes (Self Esteem)
Blue Planet (Ontario Place Film)
Board Curriculum Guides
Building Students' Self Esteem
Code of Behaviour
Computers in Ed., Part 1
Computers In Ed. Catalogue
Computers in Ed Newsletter
Co-Operative Learning Guide
Drama Themes
Fair Play Program
Focus On Forests
Friendly Math
Great Beginnings -Metro Binder
Houseleague Activities
I Am Loveable And Capable
Jigsaw Strategies
Kite Days
Language Matters
OSIS Document
Magic Circle
Ministry Guidelines
Moving Colours Program
National Geographic
OAIP Junior Language
Principal's Honour Roll
Reading Recovery program
Rights of Passage
Showtime
Springboards
Step by Step
Three Steps Toward Success
Together We Learn
Transition Years
T.V Ontario
Values Ed Newsletter
Values Policy Document
Voyage of the Mimi
We're All In The Same Boat Now
What Can One Teacher Do?
What's Worth Fighting For
William Purkey (Invitational Schools - tape)

APPENDIX F

PRINCIPALS' MEMORANDUM
No. 1990-91 P-15
Date: February 8, 1991

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE CITY OF SCARBOROUGH

To: Principals of all Elementary Schools

From: Program Department

Subject: **Elementary Focused Interviews**

The elementary school focused interview project is a major endeavour for the CRDI Committee and Program Department this year. The interviews, to be conducted with every elementary school, will provide Program Department with a "snapshot" of the status of CRDI in the elementary schools, identify future directions for Program, and provide schools with information to assess their own progress and to plan for future years.

The Focused Interview project has been designed and co-ordinated by a committee of elementary school personnel and Program Department staff, acting as a subcommittee of the CRDI committee. The CRDI Committee, with its representation from a number of system wide constituencies, retains final approval of all methods and recommendations from the subcommittee.

The interview teams are composed of two people. All interviewers are elementary Principals, Vice-Principals and Teachers Specially Assigned who have taken part in two training sessions in preparation for the interviews.

Interviews will be conducted from the end of the March Break until the end of June. A member of the Interview Team assigned to your school will contact you shortly to establish a date and time for the interview. Interviews are being conducted with three pilot schools in February to assure the questions are appropriate and that the interview is not longer than the anticipated timeframe.

Our expectation is that the interview will be conducted with the school Curriculum Management Team, although Principals may wish to include other staff members where they deem it appropriate in order to provide professional growth. Program Department will pay supply teacher costs where necessary if the interview is conducted during the school day. Each interview will be approximately 1-1/2 hours in duration.

The Associate Superintendents/Schools are committed to making every effort to attend all the interviews in their Area. The Superintendents will notify schools of the dates they have available for the interviews.

We are relying on the Principals to explain the details of the process to teachers in the school. A summary of the areas which will be discussed during the focused interviews is attached to this memo. Principals should feel free to discuss these general areas and issues with their staff in advance of the interviews.

Contd./2

2/ Contd.

As the attached information outlines, all results will be strictly confidential to our Research Director, Dr. Lorna Earl. Please stress that in no way is the Focused Interview process an evaluation of either the school or of individual teachers.

A summary of findings and recommendations will be available in the Fall.

Thank you for your co-operation in making the Focused Interview process a successful venture which will lead to recommendations to improve the CRDI process and the quality of education in our schools.

Jeanne P. Milovanovic
Associate Superintendent
Program Department

Donald A. Robb
Associate Superintendent
Program Department

Rollit J. Goldring
Superintendent
Program Department

Attach.

JPM:DAR:RJG:ah